

VI. ADOPTION

Recommendation 5.5.1 calls for the plan to be formally adopted by the Board of Harbor Commissioners, the City Plan Commission and the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee. The recommendation also calls for the City to ask Milwaukee County to use the plan for a guide in its decision making. The task force further stated that the plan should be adopted "as part of the City's Comprehensive Plan" in its letter of transmittal to the Mayor.

In December 1992, Mayor Norquist initiated the formal approval process by submitting the plan to the Common Council. By November 1993, the plan had been formally adopted by the City of Milwaukee and the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors. Each of the reviewing and adopting bodies reacted favorably to the plan as a whole, but concerns were voiced about a small number of aspects of the plan. It became apparent that these concerns should be reflected in the plan document.

It falls to the City Plan Commission under section 62.23(3)(b), Wisconsin Statutes to adopt a comprehensive or "master" plan for the City. Following its review, which included a public hearing on the Plan for Milwaukee's Lakefront on February 8, 1993, the Commission determined that the concerns of the other public bodies should be accommodated by revising the plan when concerns could be addressed by clarifying, but staying consistent with, the intention of the task force. When an adopting body specifically departed from a task force recommendation or raised questions not considered by the task force, the Commission decided that such differences should be described in this chapter which is an addition to the task force report. As a result, this document now includes both a description of the plan, set forth in chapters I through V, and a record of actions taken on the plan, which is this chapter. The following sections describe the specific actions taken in their chronological order by the adopting bodies.

Board of Harbor Commissioners:

The Board of Harbor Commissioners adopted the plan with two modifications at its meeting on January 26, 1993. The Board stated its "strenuous" objection to the proposed expansion of the Milwaukee Art Museum building and to plan recommendation 2.1.1 which would allow the expansion if certain conditions are met. The Board also stated its position that the lakewalk around the perimeter of Henry Maier Festival Park should be open to public access even when festivals and special events are operating.

In its review, the City Plan Commission considered the background to the recommendations. Regarding the potential expansion of the Milwaukee Art Museum, the Commission found that the matter was extensively debated by the task force and the wording of the recommendation was carefully crafted to represent the majority opinion of the task force members. Therefore the Commission declined to change recommendation 2.1.1 in the plan.

Regarding the Maier Festival Park lakewalk, the Commission found the Harbor

Commission and task force positions to be in basic agreement. The text of recommendation 2.8.1 was changed to clarify the times and circumstances under which sections of the lakewalk should be open to the public.

Milwaukee County:

At the February 8, 1993, public hearing, representatives of Milwaukee County asked that the City Plan Commission not act on the plan until the County Executive, Board of Supervisors and Department of Parks, Recreation and Culture could formally comment on the plan. Because of the emphasis on coordination and communication in the plan, the City Plan Commission willingly agreed to delay action.

Staff from the Department of City Development met several times with staff of the County Department of Parks, Recreation and Culture to review the County's comments and concerns. These discussions resulted in an August 30, 1993 memorandum report from the Department of Parks, Recreation and Culture to the County Board Committee on Parks, Recreation and Culture. That memorandum recommended that five statements be added to the plan:

1. "Accessibility to the lakefront is of paramount importance if the area is going to continue to support the current and future level of activity. However, at this time, blanket statements regarding transit service (including light rail), small capacity additional parking lots and shuttle services should not be endorsed. Rather, additional special event parking areas (grass parking) should be encouraged based on type of event, location and anticipated attendance.
2. "The prohibition of new structures within the first 60 feet of the shoreline is too broad and restrictive. While sightlines and access remain important, the potential benefits of any new structures should be established based on their own merit.
3. "We generally support efforts to improve water quality in Lake Michigan and the Milwaukee River estuary, however, this support does not include any plans for the Estabrook Park dam.
4. "While we encourage cooperation between the cultural tenants at O'Donnell Park, the War Memorial and Art Museum, they should not be required to collaborate marketing and other efforts. The entities which occupy those facilities should be treated as independent operations.
5. "We agree that food service is an essential ingredient in an attractive lakefront. However, locations should not be dictated by Table 1 which is included as a portion of the report. There needs to be some flexibility afforded the governing agency especially if private capital is to be encouraged."

The Department of Parks, Recreation and Culture further recommended that the County formally adopt the plan with the addition of the five points set out in its memorandum report.

On September 23, 1994, the County Board acted as recommended by the County Department of Parks, Recreation and Culture, by adopting resolution File No. 93-222(a)(a). The resolution adopted the plan "including the report from the Acting Director, Milwaukee County Department of Parks, Recreation and Culture, dated August 30, 1993 and incorporated by reference herein...." The resolution was approved by County Executive F. Thomas Ament and forwarded to the City Plan Commission. A copy of the resolution is reproduced in Appendix A.

Following its review of the County's action, the City Plan Commission agreed to include the five points from the August 30, 1993 memorandum report in this chapter. It further amended the plan text in three places to reflect the County's concerns: policy 1.9 was expanded to state that temporary parking on grass or lawn areas was acceptable for special events, policy 2.4 was amended to clarify its intent regarding shoreline access for pedestrians, and recommendation 2.1.a was amended by substituting the word "encourage" for the word "require" regarding the County's role in facilitating collaboration among its lakefront tenants. The Commission also directed that an illustration be included in the report to describe how the distances from the shoreline referenced in policy 2.3 and policy 2.4 relate to one another. This illustration is Figure 6 which appears at the end of this chapter.

City Plan Commission:

The City Plan Commission formally considered the plan, the comments and action of the Board of Harbor Commissioners, the comments and action of Milwaukee County, and the public comments voiced at the February 8, 1993 public hearing at a meeting on October 4, 1993. The Commission noted that, of the twenty persons who spoke at the hearing, most endorsed the plan or aspects of it and no one asked that it be rejected by the Commission. The Commission reviewed the possible changes to the plan with staff from the Department of City Development. The Commission then adopted the plan with the amendments previously described as part of the master plan of the City of Milwaukee under section 62.23(3)(b), Wisconsin Statutes.

Common Council:

While the City Plan Commission action fulfilled the statutory requirements for adoption of the Lakefront Plan as part of the City's master plan, Common Council action was highly desirable to further establish the Lakefront Plan as official City policy and facilitate implementation of the plan by departments and agencies within City government. Accordingly, the City Plan Commission returned the plan to the Common Council with the recommendation that the Council adopt the plan as amended by the Commission. Following review of the plan by the Council's Public Improvements Committee and a positive recommendation on the plan by that Committee, the Common Council adopted the plan as amended by the City Plan Commission on November 24, 1993 through resolution File No. 921491. A copy of the Council resolution is included as Appendix B to this report.

Adoption by the Common Council completed the adoption process and completed implementation of the plan's own recommendation 5.5.1.

Figure 6.

Recommended Distance from Shoreline

Policy 2.3 and 2.4 call for certain activities to be given priority within specific distances from the shoreline in the lakefront parklands. This figure shows that these areas overlap and that the area closest to the shoreline is affected by each of the policies.

